

REMARKS

Claims 1-41 were pending as of the advisory action mailed on November 2, 2006.

Claims 36-37 have been cancelled. Claims 1, 24, 30, 38-41 have been amended. Support for the amendments to claims 1, 24 and 30 is found, for example, on page 1, lines 13-14, and page 5, lines 2-5, of the specification, and in claims 1, 24, and 30 as originally filed.

New claims 42-44 have been added. Support for these claims is found on page 5, lines 9-24, of the specification. No new matter has been added.

This Amendment is filed with a Request for Continued Examination. Reexamination and reconsideration of the action are requested in light of the following remarks.

Examiner Interview Summary

The applicant thanks the examiner for the opportunity to discuss the final action during an interview on November 13, 2006. The interview participants were examiner Chau Nguyen, primary examiner William Bashore, and applicant's representatives Andrew H. Leung and Hans R. Troesch.

The applicant and the examiners discussed the examiners' reading of U.S. Patent Application Publication US2004/0064481 A1 ("Azami"). The limitations at issue in claim 1 are "splitting an XML document into fragments according to rules" and "a content management system."

The applicant argued that the fragment configuration information disclosed in Azami, which includes position information and reference information, are not rules according to which a document is split into fragments. The examiners submitted that even if the applicant's argument is correct, there are at least implicit rules in Azami, since Azami needs some basis on which to split a document into fragments in an orderly manner.

The applicant also argued that the metadata stream separator disclosed in Azami does not constitute a "content management system" as that term is understood in the art. The examiners submitted that under the broadest reasonable interpretation of "content management system," a metadata stream separator satisfies the meaning of the term because the metadata stream separator splits a document into fragments and stores organizational information (*e.g.*, the

position information) related to the fragments. In this manner, the metadata stream separator “manages” the document and fragments, and therefore can be said to manage content and be a content management system.

Agreement with respect to the claims was not reached.

§ 102 Rejection

Claims 1-41 were rejected as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication US2004/0064481 A1 (“Azami”). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1. Claim 1 has been amended to recite:

splitting an XML document into fragments according to a plurality of rules stored in a configuration file;
binding each of the fragments to an object in a content management system; and
providing a respective reference between the XML document and each of the fragments.

The amendment adds the limitation that the XML document is split according to rules stored in a configuration file. The amendment also clarifies that a respective reference is provided between the XML document and each of the fragments.

The amendment specifies that the rules are stored in a configuration file. A configuration file containing rules is neither taught nor suggested by Azami. For at least this reason, amended claim 1 is in condition for allowance.

Claims 24 and 30. Claims 24 and 30, which correspond to claim 1, have been amended to include limitations corresponding to those of amended claim 1. For at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1, claims 24 and 30 are in condition for allowance.

Claims 2-23, 25-29, and 31-35. Claims 2-23, 25-29, and 31-35 depend directly or indirectly from claims 1, 24, or 30, and are in condition for allowance for at least the reasons stated above.

Claims 38-41. With the cancellation of claim 36, claims 38-41 have been amended to depend from claim 1. Claims 38-41 have also been amended to remedy informalities. As these claims have been amended to depend from claim 1, they are in condition for allowance for at least the reasons set forth above.

Claims 42-44. New claims 42-44 include the limitation that the plurality of rules include rules classifying relations between the XML document, the fragments, and the objects. These rules include a rule based on a relation between any two XML fragments that are both part of the XML document, a rule based on a relation between an XML object and an unparsed object that are both part of the XML document, and a rule based on a relation between an XML object that is part of the XML document and an object that is not part of the XML document. Such rules are neither taught nor suggested by Azami. For at least this reason, claims 42-44 are in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, the applicant submits that the pending claims are in condition for allowance.

By responding in the foregoing remarks only to particular positions taken by the examiner, the applicant does not acquiesce with other positions that have not been explicitly addressed. In addition, the applicant's arguments for the patentability of a claim should not be understood as implying or conceding that no other reasons for the patentability of that claim exist.

Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 11/15/2006

Andrew H. Leung
Andrew H. Leung
Reg. No. 55,374

Customer No.: 32864
Fish & Richardson P.C.
Telephone: (650) 839-5070
Facsimile: (650) 839-5071